UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,983	09/09/2003	Stephanie Myrick	DC-05301	1299

33438   7590   02/03/2010
HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP
P.O. BOX 203518
AUSTIN, TX 78720

EXAMINER
STERRETT, JONATHAN G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/03/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

tmunoz@hamiltonterrile.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _01 October 2009_.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Office Action Summary

1.   This **Final Office Action** is responsive to the amendment of 1 October 2009.

Response to Arguments

2.   The applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the amendments to the claim that the customer interface "at the sender location" operable to accept delivery reports from the customers (as per Claim 1) and that the delivery orders being received from a sender location from which the freight delivery was sent (claim 11); and receiving responses to the freight claims at the sender location (claim 11); and providing the products at a sender location and shipping the products by the logistics service provider from the sender location (claim 18); and communicating freight claims from the sender location and analyzing the responses at the sender location (claim 18); distinguishes over the cited prior art

The examiner respectfully disagrees.

The origination of goods shipment (i.e. shipping the products by the logistics provider at the sender location) and where the freight claims are communicated from or to does not patentably distinguish the claims. Nor does where the analysis being performed patentably distinguish the claim over the cited prior art. Why? These

limitations are intended use. Shipping goods from a loading dock at Walmart vs. a freight terminal does not result in a patentable distinction. Communicating freight claims from a FedEx truck or from a delivery terminal or a customer location or a shipping dock does not result in a patentable distinction. The communication of a freight claim does not patentably distinguish depending on where the communication is originating from. Nor does the shipment of freight patentably distinguish depending on what the particular location happens to be. The applicant has amended intended use limitations into the claims. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 based on Supreme Court precedent, and recent Federal Circuit decisions, the Office's guidance to examiners is that a § 101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular

apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876).

An example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps. Thus, to qualify as a § 101 statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

Claim 1 recites a system that is composed of a customer interface, a freight claim engine and a logistics service provider interface. These system elements can be considered software, not tangibly embodied on computer readable medium, i.e. software per se. Software per se is considered printed matter and is not statutory under 35 USC 101. **Claims 9-10** depend on **Claim 1** and are not statutory for this reason also.

The examiner suggests to overcome this rejection to amend into the claim that one of the elements is performed using a computer processor or a piece of hardware of some kind - to make it clear that the system element is not just software.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner

to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or

(g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6.   Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Joao (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0099567 A1).

        Regarding to claim 1, Joao discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

Joao discloses **a system for automated freight claim management of freight

deliveries** (i.e. shipment information) (paragraph [0002], lines 1-2, paragraph [0010],

lines 1-2), the system comprising:

a customer interface (i.e. receiver computer) (paragraph [0010], lines, 4)

operable to accept delivery reports (i.e. insurance claims) **from customers**

(paragraph [0187], lines 1-6); The location of the customer interface (i.e. at the sender

location or from which the freight is sent), is an intended use limitation and does not

further limit.

a central processing computer operable to automatically process the

delivery reports at the sender location to identify freight claims (i.e. insurance

claims) (paragraph [0034], lines 1-5, paragraph [0104], lines 1-5), para 45, since Joao's

invention operates over network, it uses a sender location.

a logistics service provider interface (i.e. sender or shipping computer)

(paragraph [0010], lines 3-4) **operable to communicate freight claims** (i.e. insurance

claim) **to the logistics service provider at the sender location and to receive** (i.e.

transmit and/or receive) **logistics service provider responses** (paragraph [0017], lines

1-7, paragraph [0187], lines 1-6); para 45 over a network, i.e. involving a sender

location

wherein the central processing computer is further operable to process

logistics service provider responses at the sender location (i.e. carrier) to resolve

freight claims (paragraph [0034], lines 1-5). Para 45, over a network, i.e. involving a

sender location.

Joao does not necessarily teach where the sender location for the above

functionality is at the same sender location (nor does Joao necessarily teach where the

sender location is the manufacturer of the goods), however the location where the

functionality is provided does not change regardless of the location, i.e. where the

sender location is located does not change the functionality of what is being claimed,

i.e. the transmission, processing and reception of information relating to logistics claims.

However, Joao does not explicitly disclose a freight claim engine that provides

the claimed functionality. It is common knowledge in the prior art for a central

processing computer (i.e. freight claim engine) to provide the functionality of the claimed

invention to operate the system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made for the system of Joao to include a freight claim engine

operable to automatically process the delivery reports to identify freight claims, wherein

the freight claim engine is further operable to process logistics service provider

responses to resolve freight claims. The motivation for doing so would have been for

the central processing computer (i.e. freight claim engine) to drive/automate the

functionality of automatically processing the delivery reports to identify freight claims,

wherein the freight claim engine is further operable to process logistics service provider

responses to resolve freight claims.

Regarding to claim 11, Joao discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

Joao discloses a method for automated freight claims management of freight deliveries

(i.e. shipment information) (paragraph [0002], lines 1-8), the method comprising:

receiving delivery reports (i.e. information) from customers (paragraph [0187], lines 1-6);

identifying delivery reports as freight claims (paragraph [0035], lines 3-8), automatically

communicating (i.e. transmit) freight claims to a logistics service provider associated

with the freight deliveries (paragraph [0017], lines 1-7); receiving responses to the

freight claims from the logistics service provider (i.e. sender) (paragraph [0017], lines 1-

7) and automatically resolving the freight claims according to the logistic service

provider responses (paragraph [0034], lines 1-5). However, Joao does not explicitly

disclose using one or more predetermined factors to identify delivery reports as freight

claims (i.e. insurance claims). It is common knowledge in the prior art to use

predetermined factors to identify delivery reports as freight claims (i.e. insurance

claims). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made for the method of Joao to include the feature of

identifying delivery reports as freight claims (i.e. insurance claims) by one or more

predetermined factors. The motivation for doing so would have been to identify the

information (i.e. delivery reports) as freight claims in order to resolve the freight claims

according to the logistics service provider responses.

10.   Claims 2 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Joao (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0099567 A1) in view of Hancock et al. (U.S. Pat. No.

6,785,718 B2).

Regarding to claims 2 and 4, Joao discloses the invention substantially as

claimed. Joao discloses providing a notification of a lost or found shipment (i.e. off-track

shipment/mis-delivered shipment) (paragraph [0029], lines 1-6). However, Joao does

not disclose wherein the freight claim engine is further operable to resolve freight claims

by automatically generating a re-delivery order for logistics service provider responses

of lost freight (as per claim 2) and wherein the freight claim engine is further operable to

resolve freight claims by automatically precluding a re-delivery order for logistics service

provider responses of found freight (as per claim 4). Hancock et al. discloses reviewing

orders to identify discrepancies and addressing the discrepancies by canceling or

rescheduling the orders (column 10, lines 19-22). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

combine the system of Joao with the feature of wherein the freight claim engine is

further operable to resolve freight claims by automatically generating a re-delivery order

for logistics service provider responses of lost freight (as per claim 2) and wherein the

freight claim engine is further operable to resolve freight claims by automatically

precluding (i.e. canceling) a re-delivery order for logistics service provider responses of

found freight (as per claim 4) as taught by Hancock et al., as both Joao and Hancock et

al. are directed to the system for automated freight claim management of freight

deliveries. The motivation for doing so would have been to generate a re-delivery order

for lost freight and precluding a re-delivery order for found freight.

Regarding to claim 5, Joao and Hancock et al. discloses the invention

substantially as claimed. However, Joao and Hancock et al. do not explicitly disclose

an accounting engine interfaced with the freight claims engine and operable to track

payment balances to the logistics service provider based on the identified freight claims

and the logistics service provider responses. Joao discloses a database containing

various electronic payment information, credit card account information, financial

account information, etc. (paragraph [0127], lines 1-11). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the

system of Joao and Hancock et al. to include an accounting engine interfaced with the

freight claims engine and operable to track payment balances to the logistics service

provider based on the identified freight claims and the logistics service provider

responses as taught by Joao, as both Hancock et al. and Joao are directed to the

system for automated freight claim management of freight deliveries. The motivation for

doing so would have been to track payment balances based on the identified freight

claims and the logistic service provider responses.

Regarding to claim 6, Joao and Hancock et al. discloses the invention

substantially as claimed. However, Joao does not disclose wherein the logistics service

provider interface comprises an EDI communications interface. Hancock et al.

discloses connecting interfaces (i.e. nodes) using Electronic Data Interchange (EDI)

(column 5, lines 43-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Joao with

the feature of wherein the logistics service provider interface comprises an EDI

communications interface as taught by Hancock et al., as both Joao and Hancock et al.

are directed to the system for automated freight claim management of freight deliveries.

The motivation for doing so would have been to reduce the cost of using paper

documents to transfer information/data.

11.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joao

(U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0099567 A1) in view of Hancock et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,785,718

B2) and further in view of Campbell et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0030572 A1).

Regarding to claim 3, Joao and Hancock et al. discloses the invention

substantially as claimed. However, Joao and Hancock et al. do not disclose a response

time engine interfaced with the freight claim engine and operable to assign a response

of lost freight to a freight claim if the logistics service provider fails to respond to the

freight claim in a predetermined time. Campbell et al. discloses triggering an alarm if

the delivery is not picked up or delivered within accepted periods of time (paragraph

[0057], lines 13-19, paragraph [0081], lines 15-17). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

combine the system of Joao and Hancock et al. with the feature of a response time

engine interfaced with the freight claim engine and operable to assign a response of lost

freight to a freight claim if the logistics service provider fails to respond to the freight

claim in a predetermined time as taught by Campbell et al., as Joao and Hancock et al.

and Campbell et al. are directed to the system for automated freight claim management

of freight deliveries. The motivation for doing so would have been to assign a response

of lost freight if the logistic service provider fails to respond to the freight claim in a

predetermined time.

7.   Claims 7, 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Joao (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0099567 A1) in view of Wiesenmaier (U.S. Pub. No.

2002/0120533 A1).

Regarding to claims 7, 8 and 12, Joao discloses the invention substantially as

claimed. However, Joao does not explicitly disclose wherein the deliveries comprise

built to order products (as per claim 7) and wherein the built to order products comprise

information handling systems (as per claims 8 and 12). Wiesenmaier discloses

delivering built to order (i.e. made-to-specification) products (paragraph [0003], lines 1-

3). It is also common knowledge in the prior art for built to order products to include

information handling systems in order to customize the information handling system

according to an individual or organization's specifications. Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to combine the system and method of Joao with the feature of wherein the deliveries

comprise built to order products (as per claim 7) and wherein the built to order products

comprise information handling systems (as per claims 8 and 12) as taught by

Wiesenmaier, as both Joao and Wiesenmaier are directed to the system and method for

automated freight claim management of freight deliveries. The motivation for doing so

would have been to deliver freight consisting of built to order products, wherein the built

to order products comprise information handling systems.

8.   Claims 9, 10, 13, 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Joao (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0099567 A1) in view of Wiesenmaier

(U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0120533 A1) and further in view of Hancock et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,785,718 B2).

Regarding to claim 9, Joao and Wiesenmaier discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Joao and Wiesenmaier do not disclose an information handling system order validation engine associated with the freight claims engine and operable to compare information associated with freight claims with one or more required information fields to identify and intercept deficient freight claims from communication to the logistics service provider. Hancock et al. discloses comparing and updating purchase orders (column 10, lines 4-8 and 13-15) and running an error log report to identify any undefined information (column 10, lines 29-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Joao and Wiesenmaier with the feature of an information handling system order validation engine associated with the freight claims engine and operable to compare information associated with freight claims with one or more required information fields to identify and intercept deficient freight claims from communication to the logistics service provider as taught by Hancock et al., as Joao, Wiesenmaier and Hancock et al. are all directed to the system for automated freight claim management of freight deliveries. The motivation for doing so would have been to validate built to order product orders and intercept deficient freight claims.

Regarding to claim 10, Joao and Wiesenmaier discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Joao and Wiesenmaier do not disclose wherein the freight claims engine generates re-delivery orders for deficient freight claims. Hancock

et al. discloses generating re-delivery orders (i.e. rescheduling) for orders that have

discrepancies and those that were not executed (column 10, lines 19-22). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the system of Joao and Wiesenmaier with the feature of wherein

the freight claims engine generates re-delivery orders for deficient freight claims as

taught by Hancock et al., as Joao, Wiesenmaier and Hancock et al. are all directed to

the system for automated freight claim management of freight deliveries. The

motivation for doing so would have been to re-deliver orders for deficient freight claims.

Regarding to claims 13, Joao discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

Joao discloses providing a notification of a lost or found shipment (i.e. off-track

shipment/mis-delivered shipment) (paragraph [0029], lines 1-6). However, Joao does

not disclose automatically initiating re-delivery of an information handling system

identified as lost by a logistics service provider response; and automatically precluding

re-delivery of an information handling system identified as found by a logistics service

provider. Hancock et al. discloses reviewing orders to identify discrepancies and

addressing the discrepancies by canceling or rescheduling the orders (column 10, lines

19-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to combine the method of Joao with the feature of

wherein automatically resolving the freight claims further comprises: automatically

initiating re-delivery (i.e. rescheduling) of an information handling system identified as

lost by a logistics service provider response; and automatically precluding re-delivery

(i.e. canceling) of an information handling system identified as found by a logistics

service provider as taught by Hancock et al., as both Joao, Wiesenmaier and Hancock

et al. are directed to the method for automated freight claim management of freight

deliveries. The motivation for doing so would have been to generate a re-delivery order

for lost freight and precluding a re-delivery order for found freight.

Regarding to claim 15, Joao and Wiesenmaier discloses the invention

substantially as claimed. However, Joao and Wiesenmaier do not disclose validating

freight claim information before sending freight claims to the logistics service provider;

and initiating re-delivery of information handling systems associated with an invalid

freight claim. Hancock et al. discloses comparing and updating purchase orders

(column 10, lines 4-8 and 13-15), running an error log report to identify any undefined

information (column 10, lines 29-31) and generating re-delivery orders (i.e.

rescheduling) for orders that have discrepancies and those that were not executed

(column 10, lines 19-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Joao and

Wiesenmaier with the feature of validating freight claim information before sending

freight claims to the logistics service provider; and initiating re-delivery of information

handling systems associated with an invalid freight claim as taught by Hancock et al., as

Joao, Wiesenmaier and Hancock et al. are all directed to the method for automated

freight claim management of freight deliveries. The motivation for doing so would have

been to validate freight claim information and to initiate re-delivery orders for invalid

freight claim.

Regarding to claim 16, Joao, Wiesenmaier and Hancock et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Joao, Wiesenmaier and Hancock et al. do not explicitly disclose tracking payment balance based on the identified freight claims and the logistics service provider responses; and communicating the payment balances to a financial institution associate with payments to the logistics service provider for the deliveries. Joao discloses a database containing various electronic payment information, credit card account information, financial account information, etc. (paragraph [0127], lines 1-11) and communicating the information (paragraph [0125], lines 1-7, paragraph [0128]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the method of Joao, Wiesenmaier and Hancock et al. to include tracking payment balance based on the identified freight claims and the logistics service provider responses; and communicating the payment balances to a financial institution associate with payments to the logistics service provider for the deliveries as taught by Joao, as Wiesenmaier, Hancock et al. and Joao are directed to the method for automated freight claim management of freight deliveries. The motivation for doing so would have been to track and communicate payment balances based on the identified freight claims and the logistic service provider responses.

Regarding to claim 17, Joao, Wiesenmaier and Hancock et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Joao and Wiesenmaier do not disclose wherein communicating freight claims and balances further comprises sending EDI messages. Hancock et al. discloses connecting interfaces (i.e. nodes) using Electronic

Data Interchange (EDI) (column 5, lines 43-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Joao and Wiesenmaier with the feature of wherein communicating freight claims and balances further comprises sending EDI messages as taught by Hancock et al., as Joao, Wiesenmaier and Hancock et al. are directed to the method for automated freight claim management of freight deliveries. The motivation for doing so would have been to reduce the cost of using paper documents to transfer information/data.

Regarding to claim 18, Joao discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Joao discloses a method for manufacturer management of freight claims (i.e. insurance claims), the method comprising (paragraph [0002], lines 1-2, paragraph [0034]):; providing the products to a logistics service provider for delivery of each product to a location associated with a customer (i.e. receiver) (paragraph [0059], paragraph [0180], lines 1-2); receiving freight claims (i.e. insurance claims) from customers for failure of the logistics service provider to deliver products (paragraph [0187], lines 1-6); automatically communicating the freight claims to the logistics service provider (paragraph [0193], lines 1-6), receiving responses (i.e. information) of the logistics service provider to freight claims (paragraph [0017], lines 1-7, paragraph [0187], lines 1-6) and providing a notification of a lost or found shipment (i.e. off-track shipment/mis-delivered shipment) (paragraph [0029], lines 1-6). However, Joao does not explicitly disclose freight claims (i.e. insurance claims) associated with delivery of build to order products by a logistics service provider, accepting orders from plural customers for products to be built to a customer-ordered configuration; building the products;

automatically re-building the products associated with a response of lost or damaged;

and precluding the re-building of products associated with a response of found.

Wiesenmaier discloses delivery of build to order products (i.e. made-to-specification)

(paragraph [0003], lines 1-3), accepting orders form plural customers for products to be

built to a customer-ordered configuration (paragraph [0048], lines 5-7), building (i.e.

creating) the products (paragraph [0048], lines 8-9, paragraph [0113], lines 5-6).

Hancock et al. discloses reviewing orders to identify discrepancies and addressing the

discrepancies by canceling or rescheduling the orders (column 10, lines 19-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to combine the method of Joao with the feature of freight claims

(i.e. insurance claims) associated with delivery of build to order products by a logistics

service provider, accepting orders from plural customers for products to be built to a

customer-ordered configuration; building the products; automatically re-building the

products associated with a response of lost or damaged; and precluding the re-building

of products associated with a response of found as taught by Wiesenmaier and

Hancock et al., as Joao, Wiesenmaier and Hancock et al. are directed to a method for

manufacturer management of freight claims associated with delivery of build to order

products by a logistics service provider. The motivation for doing so would have been

to re-build lost or damaged products and precluding re-building of found products.

Regarding to claim 19, Joao, Wiesenmaier and Hancock et al. discloses the

invention substantially as claimed. However, Joao, Wiesenmaier and Hancock et al. do

not explicitly disclose validating that the location associated with freight claims matches

the location provided to the logistics service provider for the products. Joao discloses

verifying that a shipment is being delivered to the proper receiver (paragraph [0031],

lines 1-4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Wiesenmaier and

Hancock et al. with the feature of validating that the location associated with freight

claims matches the location provided to the logistics service provider for the products as

taught by Joao, as Wiesenmaier, Hancock et al. and Joao are directed to the method for

manufacturer management of freight claims associated with delivery of build to order

products by a logistics service provider. The motivation for doing so would have been

to validate that a shipment is being delivered to the proper receiver associated with the

freight claims.

Regarding to claim 20, Joao, Wiesenmaier and Hancock et al. discloses the

invention substantially as claimed. However, Joao, Wiesenmaier and Hancock et al. do

not explicitly disclose wherein the products comprise information handling systems.

Wiesenmaier discloses delivering built to order (i.e. made-to-specification) products

(paragraph [0003], lines 1-3). It is common knowledge in the prior art for built to order

products to include information handling systems in order to customize the information

handling system according to an individual or organization's specifications. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the method of Joao with the feature of wherein the products

comprise information handling systems as taught by Wiesenmaier, as both Joao,

Hancock et al. and Wiesenmaier are directed to the method for manufacturer

management of freight claims associated with delivery of build to order products by a

logistics service provider. The motivation for doing so would have been to deliver

freight consisting of build to order products, wherein the build to order products

comprise information handling systems.

9.   Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joao

(U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0099567 A1) in view of Wiesenmaier (U.S. Pub. No.

2002/0120533 A1) in view of Hancock et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,785,718 B2) and further in

view of Campbell et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0030572 A1).

Regarding to claim 14, Joao, Wiesenmaier and Hancock et al. discloses the

invention substantially as claimed. However, Joao, Wiesenmaier and Hancock et al. do

not disclose tracking response times between freight claim communications to logistics

service providers and logistics service provider responses; and assigning a logistics

service provider response of lost if a predetermined response time lapses. Campbell et

al. discloses triggering an alarm if an acknowledgement of delivery is not received and if

the delivery is not picked up or delivered within accepted periods of time (paragraph

[0057], lines 13-19, paragraph [0081], lines 5-12 and 15-17). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to combine the method of Joao, Wiesenmaier and Hancock et al. with the feature of

tracking response times between freight claim communications to logistics service

providers and logistics service provider responses; and assigning a logistics service

provider response of lost if a predetermined response time lapses as taught by

Campbell et al. as Joao, Wiesenmaier, Hancock et al. and Campbell et al. are directed

to the method for automated freight claim management of freight deliveries. The

motivation for doing so would have been to assign a response of lost freight if the

logistic service provider fails to respond to the freight claim in a predetermined time.

Conclusion

10.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

        A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

.

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jonathan G. Sterrett whose telephone number is 571-

272-6881. The examiner can normally be reached 8-6 Monday - Friday (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Beth V. Boswell can be reached on 571-272-6737. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

1-29-2010 JGS
/Jonathan G. Sterrett/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623